

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1, 4-6, 8, and 9 are amended and new Claims 10-17 are added by the present amendment. As amended Claims 1, 4-6, 8, and 9 and new Claims 10-17 are supported by the original disclosure,<sup>1</sup> no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Agraharam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,482, hereinafter Agraharam) in view of Porter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,299, hereinafter Porter).

With regard to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Agraharam in view of Porter, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 recites in part:

reception means for receiving a group request to include a corresponding one of the plurality of information processing apparatuses in one of the plurality of groups, the group request selecting a respective one of the plurality of groups, *the group request transmitted from any of the information processing apparatuses belonging to one of the plurality of groups*, and for receiving a content request transmitted from any of the information processing apparatuses belonging to one of the plurality of groups, the content request including a selection from the list of available content;

(Emphasis added.)

The outstanding Office Action cited Agraharam as describing “reception means” at page 3, paragraphs 27 and 36.<sup>2</sup> However, Agraharam describes a system where a “conductor” at conductor session terminal (201) selects the client terminals (103) and (104) that will receive selected documents by including these terminals on a participation list (PL).<sup>3</sup> Agraharam describes that *only* conductor session terminal (201) is configured to set this

---

<sup>1</sup>See, e.g. the specification at page 20, lines 3-20 and Figure 9.

<sup>2</sup>See outstanding Office Action, page 3, line 8.

<sup>3</sup>See Agraharam, paragraph 27.

participation list.<sup>4</sup> Thus, Agraharam does not teach or suggest that a group request is transmitted from *any* of the information processing apparatuses belonging to one of the plurality of groups, as recited in amended Claim 1. As Porter does not cure the above noted deficiencies of Agraharam, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 (and Claims 2 and 3 dependent therefrom) is patentable over Agraharam in view of Porter.

Independent Claim 5 recites similar elements to Claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 5 is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Agraharam in view of Porter, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 4 recites in part:

a reception step of receiving a group request to include a corresponding one of the plurality of information processing apparatuses in one of the plurality of groups, the group request selecting a respective one of the plurality of groups, and for receiving a content request transmitted from any of the information processing apparatuses belonging to one of the plurality of groups, the content request including a selection from the list of available content, *the group request and the content request received by the single shared server*;

an acquisition step of acquiring data coordinated with the content request *to the single shared server*; and

a communication step of transmitting the data acquired by the acquisition step simultaneously *from the single shared server to all of those of the information processing apparatuses* accessing the single shared server and belonging to a same group.

(Emphasis added.)

In contrast, Agraharam describes a system where a request from a session conductor is received by data network interface 301, and data corresponding to the session conductor's multimedia presentation is broadcast by broadcast interface 308.<sup>5</sup> Thus, Agraharam describes receiving a request from a session conductor and transmitting data corresponding to the

---

<sup>4</sup>See Agraharam, paragraphs 27 and 36.

<sup>5</sup>See Agraharam, paragraph 24.

session conductor's multimedia presentation with *two different servers*. Thus, Agraharam does not teach or suggest "the group request and the content request received by the *single shared server*" and "a communication step of transmitting the data acquired by the acquisition step simultaneously from the *single shared server* to all of those of the information processing apparatuses accessing the single shared server and belonging to a same group" as recited in amended Claim 4. As Porter does not cure the above noted deficiencies of Agraharam, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 4 is patentable over Agraharam in view of Porter.

Independent Claim 8 recites similar elements to Claim 4. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 8 is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 4.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Agraharam in view of Porter, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 6 recites in part:

inputting means for inputting access information into a *single window of a media player* configured to access the service providing apparatus to select one of a plurality of groups;

display control means for controlling display of a list of available content transmitted from the service providing apparatus *in the single window of the media player*;

requesting means for selecting content from the list of available content in the single window of the locally executed program and requesting the service providing apparatus for transmission of the selected content to said information processing apparatus belonging to one of the plurality of groups and all of the other information processing apparatuses accessing the shared server belonging to a same group *by activating a command in the single window of the media player*;

(Emphasis added.)

Agraharam describes a system where a request from a session conductor is received "via an internet browsing package, such as Netscape Navigator or Microsoft Internet

Explorer.”<sup>6</sup> As internet browsing packages such as Netscape Navigator or Microsoft Internet Explorer are not a “media player” as defined in Claim 6, Agraharam does not teach or suggest “inputting means for inputting access information *into a single window of a media player*,” “display control means for controlling display of a list of available content transmitted from the service providing apparatus *in the single window of the media player*,” or “requesting means” as recited in amended Claim 6. As Porter does not cure the above noted deficiencies of Agraharam, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 6 (and Claims 7 and 11 dependent therefrom) is patentable over Agraharam in view of Porter.

Independent Claim 9 recites similar elements to Claim 6. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 9 (and Claim 10 dependent therefrom) is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 6.

New Claims 10 and 11 are supported at least by the specification at page 20, lines 3-20 and Figure 9. As new Claims 10 and 11 depend from Claims 9 and 6, respectively, new Claims 10 and 11 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons described above with respect to Claim 6.

New Claims 12-17 are supported at least by Claims 1-3, 6, and 7, the specification at page 20, lines 3-20, and Figure 9. New independent Claims 12 and 15 recite similar elements to Claims 1 and 6, respectively without using “means plus function” elements. Accordingly, Claim 12 (and Claims 13 and 14 dependent therefrom) is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons described above with respect to Claim 1. Claim 15 (and Claims 16 and 17 dependent therefrom) is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons described above with respect to Claim 6.

Consequently, in light of the foregoing comments and present amendment, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-17 patentably defines over the

---

<sup>6</sup>Agraharam, paragraph 26.

Application No. 09/684,063  
Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2006

asserted references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Edward Tracy  
Registration No. 47,998

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)  
I:\ATTY\ET\202708US\202708US-AMD6.17.06.DOC